

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

The title of the invention is alleged to be not descriptive and a new title is required.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of informalities.

Claim 1 stands objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,525,704 to Kondo.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,758,538 to Fujita.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended the title of the invention, the objected-to claim 1 and abstract of the disclosure by adopting the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Applicant has also amended claim 1 to differently define the invention and to improve its form. In addition, Applicant has added new claims 14-21.

Accordingly, claims 1-21 are pending in the present application with claims 9-13 being withdrawn from consideration.

**The Title of the Invention**

Applicant has amended the title by adopting the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the new title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

**Objection to Abstract**

The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the abstract by adopting the Examiner's helpful suggestion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

**Objection to Claim 1**

Claim 1 stands objected to because of minor informalities. Applicant has deleted the claim languages with which the Examiner is concerned. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo, and claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Fujita. To the extent that these rejections might be reapplied to the claims as newly

amended, they are respectfully traversed as being based on a reference or a combination of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features now recited in the claims.

With regard to independent claim 1, as newly amended, Applicant respectfully submits that Kondo does not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the recited feature of “an insulating layer on the organic emitting layer and exposing a part of the ground line such that the second electrode is directly connected to the ground line.”

The Office Action appears to allege that Kondo discloses the present invention by citing to illustrations of FIG. 5 of Kondo. In contrast to the present invention wherein an insulation layer (204) is deposited on an organic emitting layer (272) as shown in FIG. 7E and as further described at paragraphs [0038] and [0039], Kondo merely disclose that an insulating layer (36) is deposited on source/drain electrodes (34, 35) but under an organic emitting layer (42, 43 and 44). Kondo neither teaches nor suggests that the insulating layer (36) may be deposited on the organic emitting layer (42, 43 and 44). In other words, Applicant respectfully submits that Kondo fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the feature of “an insulating layer on the organic emitting layer and exposing a part of the ground line such that the second electrode is directly connected to the ground line,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the insulating layer (36) of Kondo should correspond to a passivation layer (228) of the present invention but not to the insulating layer (204) of the present invention. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that the

insulating layer (36) of Kondo does not correspond to the insulating layer now claimed in newly-amended independent claim 1.

In addition, the Office Action does not rely upon Fujita to remedy the above deficiencies of Kondo. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Fujita cannot remedy the deficiencies of Kondo. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Kondo and Fujita, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the above recited feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Kondo does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, as newly-amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections of dependent claims 2-8 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon newly-amended independent claim 1 and for the reasons set forth above.

#### **New Claims 14-21**

Applicant has added new claims 14-21 to further define the invention. More particularly,

Applicant submits that none of the cited prior art references disclose a combination of features including “an organic luminescent unit in the array unit and having a first electrode under the first insulating layer, an organic emitting layer on both the first electrode and the first insulating layer, a second insulating layer on both the organic emitting layer and the first insulating layer, and a second electrode on the second insulating,” as recited in claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 14-21 are allowable over the prior art of record based on the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejection pending, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 and 14-21 are in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Reg. No. 47,256

Dated: December 7, 2004

Customer No.: 009629  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-7000  
Facsimile: 202-739-3001